

REMARKS

Claims 6-19 are pending, with claims 6, 7, and 10 being independent. Claim 7 has been amended, and claims 14-19 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in the originally-filed specification, at least at page 7, line 3 to page 14, line 8. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has indicated that the abstract is somehow not proper. Applicant has amended the abstract. Additionally, applicant has amended the specification to reflect the update to the priority application, as suggested by the Examiner. Also, in accordance with the Examiner's requirement, applicant has amended the title to be "Method of manufacturing a Light-Emitting Device."

Independent claim 6 recites a method of manufacturing a light emitting device. The method includes forming at least a transparent protrusion, forming a pixel electrode to overlap the transparent protrusion, forming an organic layer to overlap the pixel electrode, and forming a cathode over the organic layer.

Claim 6 has been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,246,179 (Yamada). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because Yamada fails to describe or suggest forming at least a transparent protrusion, in which a pixel electrode is formed to overlap the transparent protrusion.

Yamada relates to an EL element 60 including a insulating film 17 formed over a substrate 10, an anode 61 formed over the insulating film 17, an emissive layer 66 formed over the anode 19, and a cathode 67 formed over the emissive layer 66. See Yamada at col. 6, line 7 to col. 7, line 6 and Fig. 4B. The Examiner indicates that the insulating film 17 of Yamada is somehow a transparent protrusion. However, the insulating film 17 of Yamada is neither a protrusion nor transparent. First, as Yamada explains, the insulating film 17 is a "planarizing" film that creates a flat surface on which to place the anode 61. See Yamada at col. 6, lines 21-24. Therefore, Yamada's insulating film 17 is void of a protrusion. Second, as Yamada explains, the insulating film 17 is "not transparent but colored" where the coloring is made possible by "applying resin such as a color resist." See Yamada at col. 9, lines 5-7. Yamada explains that

the "color used for the coloring may be any color that can shield the emitted light, but is preferably black" since black "allows absorption of light that travels to the metal cathode 67 and reflects off the cathode 67." See Yamada at col. 9, lines 7-11. Therefore, Yamada's insulating film 17 is not transparent. For at least these reasons, claim 6 is allowable over Yamada.

Independent claim 7 recites a personal computer including a main body, a casing, a display portion, and a keyboard. The personal computer includes a light emitting device that includes, among other features, at least a transparent protrusion, and a pixel electrode over the transparent protrusion.

Claims 7-9 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,217,183 (Shipman) in view of Yamada. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because Shipman and Yamada, alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest forming at least a transparent protrusion, where a pixel electrode is formed to overlap the transparent protrusion. Shipman merely relates to a keyboard that has illuminated keys. See Shipman at abstract. There is no suggestion in Shipman of a light-emitting element having a transparent protrusion. Moreover, as discussed above, Yamada fails to cure the deficiencies of Shipman to describe or suggest such a transparent protrusion. For at least these reasons, claim 7 is allowable over any possible combination of Shipman and Yamada. Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7, and are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 7 is allowable.

Independent claim 10 recites a portable telephone including a main body, a sound output portion, a sound input portion, a display portion, operation switches, and an antenna. The portable telephone also includes a light emitting device that includes, among other features, at least a transparent protrusion, and a pixel electrode over the transparent protrusion.

Claims 10-13 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,330,461 (Anderson) in view of Yamada. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because Anderson and Yamada, alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest forming at least a transparent protrusion, where a pixel electrode is formed to overlap the transparent protrusion. Anderson merely relates to a mobile telephone that includes status indicators and control buttons. See Anderson at col. 1, lines 2-5 and col. 2, lines 14-37. There is no suggestion in Anderson of a

light-emitting element having a transparent protrusion. Moreover, as discussed above, Yamada fails to cure the deficiencies of Anderson to describe or suggest such a transparent protrusion. For at least these reasons, claim 10 is allowable over any possible combination of Anderson and Yamada. Claims 11-13 depend from claim 10, and are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 10 is allowable.

New claims 14-19 depend from claim 6 and are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 6 is allowable.

Enclosed is a \$120 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2006

/Diana DiBerardino/
Diana DiBerardino
Reg. No. 45,653

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331